Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

mander has entered France as Wellington. The arrangement of the concluding chapters is more conventional—the Russian campaign, the war in Germany, the first restoration, the earlier sessions of the Congress of Vienna, the Hundred Days, the close of the Congress. Room is then found for an account of Great Britain and Ireland from the opening of the revolutionary wars in 1792 to their close in 1815 and for a second chapter on the changes in the British empire at large during this same period. The volume closes with a short account of Napoleon's sojourn on St. Helena and his *apologia*. This order of treatment may not be exceptionally felicitous from a literary standpoint; but few will receive their first ideas of Napoleon from this volume, and to one who is already familiar with the story the arrangement will recommend itself.

As for the contributors, there are several familiar names—those of writers who have had a hand in the preceding volumes—but the internal history of France has very properly been turned over to Professor Pariset of Nancy, while Professor Guilland of Zurich has dealt with the more general European history under the Consulate. Major-General August Keim, of the German army, describes the war of 1809; the Russian invasion has been assigned to Professor Stschepkin of Odessa, and the War of Liberation to Dr. Pflugk-Harttung, formerly professor of history at Basel. Among the English writers of approved ability, Mr. Rose, Mr. Fisher and Mr. Oman are conspicuous.

It is impossible to review such a volume in detail. The separate chapters might, it is true, be criticised, but they contain quite unimpeachable information and there is little tendency to indulge in debatable speculation. The volume is but another example of the strength and weakness of the system adopted for the whole work; and this has already been discussed in a previous issue of the POLITICAL SCIENCE QUARTERLY (vol. xviii, pp. 681 *et seq.*).

J. H. ROBINSON.

The Negro and the Nation: A History of American Slavery and Enfranchisement. By GEORGE S. MERRIAM. New York, Henry Holt & Co., 1906.—436 pp.

This book at once suggests comparison with John C. Reed's *The Brothers' War*, published last year. Both deal with the same subject, the negro influence in American history, and in both the treatment is calm and philosophical, as befits books written by men of wide reading and experience. It must be said that the earlier work is more original,

and that it suggests a more judicial temper in its author. Mr. Reed kept his attention fixed upon the negro, while Mr. Merriam allows politics to hide the colored brother most of the time. Reed treats a hackneyed subject in a new way, exhibiting new facts; Merriam follows old and well-trodden paths to familiar conclusions. Most of his book is devoted to the political history of the controversy over the negro, and this is narrated from the ethical point of view. Though the history in this part of the book is fairly accurate, no real contribution is made to knowledge nor is the philosophy sound and convincing. To the author pro-slavery and anti-slavery are almost the only important forces in our early history; most else seems to hinge upon these. He sees only pro-slavery forces in ante-bellum territorial expansion. In the Kansas troubles the administration side was certainly weak enough, but here it gets no sort of justice. He overlooks the fact, moreover, that the anti-slavery spirit in the South and West was less due to moral convictions than to social and economic instincts.

After showing that the North and South were politically, socially and economically unlike, he declares that secession could not be because the United States was a "nation." His political theories throughout are those of 1861–65. Secession he pronounces "anarchy," seeing only the superficial aspects of the situation and not the social and industrial forces supporting the movement. To the Southerner it was a desperate measure taken mainly to prevent social anarchy. Time has shown, of course, that the South was mistaken; that after all, in spite of war and reconstruction, the Southerner has about all that he seceded and fought for, *viz.*, the relations between the races described by A. H. Stephens in the much misunderstood "corner-stone" speech. In assuming that Stephens's "corner stone" has been knocked out, Mr. Merriam manifests his lack of acquaintance with the practical present aspects of his subject.

On Reconstruction his views are somewhat contradictory. He condemns the radical policy, analyzes at length the shortcomings of the scalawags and carpet-baggers, and then intimates that the minority of leaderless whites might have controlled affairs, had they seen fit to make the effort, by controlling the negroes. This they certainly tried hard to do in several states, but the attempt was defeated by the radicals. Its success was clearly impossible so long as the radicals remained in power. On the "black laws," which he considers iniquitous, he follows Blaine rather than Burgess, although he cites the latter. Evidently he has read none of these laws nor any of the corresponding laws for the whites. It seems also that he is unacquainted with the substitutes of

later days. For the facts about Reconstruction Mr. Merriam accepts the testimony of the radical side and rejects that of the other side, even clearing the Ames government in Mississippi on the statements of two carpet-baggers. Following such authorities he naturally finds that most of the deviltry of Reconstruction was on the side of the whites, and that for this there was no justification. He here holds a brief for the reconstructionists. He does not understand why there should have been any fear of "negro domination" after 1876. He shows no knowledge of the manner in which the negroes have been manipulated since that eventful year. In describing the new disfranchising constitutions the objectionable temporary clauses are dealt with as permanent. In short, the entire account of political conditions in the South is superficial and shows a lack of exact information.

The best part of the book will be found in the numerous character sketches of prominent leaders in the nineteenth-century sectional controversies. Of these sketches there are about twenty—from Webster, Clay and Calhoun to Garrison and John Brown. The author's estimates are fair and judicial, in most cases sympathetic, never partisan. Mr. Merriam can understand and describe men much better than the principles they advocate.

The negro in this book is a vague sort of a person, whose main business is to cause a political situation. To "Slavery as it Was" fourteen pages are given—a curious mixture of Harriet Beecher Stowe, Kemble, Smedes, Olmstead, *etc.* To Mr. Merriam slavery was sinful and bad for all; freedom therefore must be the opposite. If he will only read the census volumes, he will find that the average free negro has not been as efficient as the average slave. He can learn the same thing by talking to a Black Belt planter or by going over the accounts of a plantation. It is true that the Southern white usually knows little of the upper thousandth of progressive blacks; Mr. Merriam knows only of these, and generalizes accordingly. There is little evidence of any practical knowledge of the various race problems; to Mr. Merriam there are none. Slavery is the scapegoat, and to it and to the failure of the South to hold proper views about it most complications are due. The author's views appear to be those of a man who has read much and seen little of the things about which he reads and writes. Like objections may be made to his conception of the Southern social system. Here again is the old story: aristocracy and poor whites were distinct classes in the ante-bellum system; the latter was under control of the former, and was "led into revolution," *etc.* Reasoning from conditions found in Boston or New Haven he finds no cause for the race separation

insisted upon in the South. More and more, he says, do the cultured representatives of both races mingle socially in the North, and he informs the South that its position in regard to social separation of the races must be modified. That there are any real difficulties in the way, any fundamental questions of race, he does not admit.

As to the general tone of the book, it may be said that while the views set forth are those of a generation ago, merely somewhat moderated in their form of statement, yet the author's judgments and expressions of opinion are remarkably free from partisan feeling. It cannot be said that he is sympathetic, for he does not understand; but the kindly intention is always evident, although at times its manifestations are irritatingly patronizing. Considering that the author so seriously endeavors to give an impartial treatment, to maintain a fair attitude, one regrets that he did not see fit to base his work upon a thorough investigation of the subject. For in these days of many books on the race problem, a writer must first be fair-minded in order to write of Southern blacks and whites, and next he ought to be a negro or a Southern white, or one who has at least seen something of these people and their ways. Interest in a problem does not qualify a person to write about it.

WALTER L. FLEMING.

WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY.

La constitución de 1857 y las leyes de reforma en Mexico. Estudio histórico-sociológico. Por RICARDO GARCIA GRANADOS. Mexico, Tipografía Económica, 1906.—135 pp.

Temperate and well-balanced treatises on the constitutional history of the Latin-American republics are so rare that when one appears it merits a consideration quite out of proportion to its size. Prepared in connection with the celebration of the hundredth anniversary of the birth of Benito Juarez, the present essay of Señor García, a member of the Federal Congress, deals with the most important and interesting episodes in the constitutional development of the republic of Mexico.

Beginning with a discussion of the plan of Ayutla of 1854 as the preliminary to the final overthrow of Santa Anna and the adoption of the constitution of 1857, the author proceeds to describe the political parties of the time. He emphasizes, in particular, the lack of harmony among the Liberals and the pernicious influence of the Conservatives—an influence directed by the military and the clergy to the maintenance of their exceptional privileges and to keeping the bulk of the Mexican people in an abject ignorance altogether commensurate with their material